DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 775 JC 720 011

TITLE	Academically Disadvantaged Minority Group Students in Public Two-Year Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE	Oct 71
NOTE	24p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Groups; *Dropout Characteristics; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Junior Colleges; *Minority Groups; Questionnaires; Surveys

ABSTRACT

A discussion of disadvantaged students in 2-year colleges concludes that they usually come from minority groups, are underrepresented in institutions of higher education, have little economic support and are characterized by marginal traditional academic qualifications. A number of classification schemes used by social scientists are discussed with the implication that administrators of 2-year colleges need to be more sensitive in identifying and selecting students who might have some chance of academic success. The final section of this paper reports that a sample of administrators view the major causes of disadvantaged student attrition as inadequate motivation, student finances, emotional stability, and academic abilities. A large percentage of administrators indicated a lack of district support of such students and inadequate finances for institutional programs. The questionnaire surveying the administrators is appended. (MN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED057775

Research Study on the Disadvantaged
Sponsored By
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202
October, 1971

ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED MINORITY GROUP STUDENTS IN PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

JC 720 011

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION
HARRISBURG, PA. 17126

Consultants:

Dr. James L. Morrison
and
Mr. Reynolds Ferrante
411 Waupelani Drive D-125
State College, Pa. 16801

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 17 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The Problem of Definition	1
Terms and Definitions	2
The Disadvantaged in Higher Education	5
The Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges	6
Methodological Considerations	8
Data Analysis	11
Summary, Conclusions and Implications	12
Bibliography	16
Appendix A	
Appendix B	

ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED MINORITY GROUP STUDENTS IN PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Introduction

In the late 50's the shock of Sputnik forced American educators to gear up their science programs; in the late 60's the militancy of minorities pressured educators into establishing programs for the "disadvantaged student." Today, the demand for such programs in colleges and universities is unequivocal. The two-year college, and particularly the public two-year college, is an institution which has been designated to assist those classified as "disadvantaged" in overcoming their handicaps, be they educational or cultural, and thereby, to assist them in their academic and social development.

The purpose of this paper is to (1) discuss the problem of defining who is disadvantaged, (2) review the literature describing the disadvantaged in higher education, and (3) examine the explanations given by institutions as to the major factors for the attrition of minority group academically disadvantaged students in two-year colleges.

The Problem of Definition

Williams has described disadvantaged students as those students "whose educational and economic background is considered markedly inferior to that of their regular students." (Williams, 1968: 2) While descriptive of the disadvantaged group as they are perceived in institutions of higher education, such a definition may be programatically useless; it is too general for the administrator who needs to select students from within target groups; it is

too general for the psychologist who wishes to guide the administrator in orienting present and future programs. Any attempt at a clear definition must meet the problems inherent in all definitions: the need for agreement on criteria and the need for selection of unique but universal terms, together with a clear recognition that any definition, however clear, is proscriptive, not prescriptive.

Terms and Definitions. The terms "culturally deprived," "educationally deprived," "deprived," "underprivileged," "lower-class," "lower socio-economic group" are often used interchangeably in the definitions of the disadvantaged "High risk" is also a frequently used term for the "disadvantaged," although this term usually refers specifically to a poor student who, according to traditional predictive criteria, is not likely to succeed at a particular school. (Williams, 1968: 2)

Kneller, an educational anthropologist, gives the following description of the "culturally disadvantaged:"

> They are generally from the lower classes and are academically backward, the second characteristic being generally, though not always, a consequence of the first. Their parents have been unable to give them the background and preparation necessary for formal learning, which the middle class parent imparts to his child as a matter of course. Since their parents often do work which requires little education, the children usually underestimate the school's capacity to prepare them for life.
>
> Coming as they do from depressed areas and often broken homes, they have little feeling that society as a whole cares for them. Consequently, they often experience great difficulty in adapting to the outside world as well as to schools permeated by middle class values. . . .Many of them fail to master the normal academic curriculum (another blow to their faltering self-esteem), many drop out of school, and few find their way to college. (Kneller, 1965: 147)

McKendall, recognizing the same conditions as Kneller from a broader perspective, maintains that cultural disadvantagement refers "to the variety of social, economic, and ethnic-interracial factors which impede full-freedom of choice and which destroy an individual's right to maximum opportunity." (McKendall, 1965: 307)

The term "cultural deprivation" has also been used to describe the "disadvantaged," although with some reaction from minority groups because of the implication that they have an inferior culture or no culture at all.

The person termed "culturally deprived" does have a culture. The "problem" is that this culture is different from the one which dominates our educational system. Since this dominant culture is expressed in its own "dialect," severe communication problems result. Recognizing this language barrier, Reissman uses the term culturally deprived to refer to those groups who have not benefited from those aspects of middle-class culture such as education, books, and formal language. (Reissman, 1962: 3)

The "socially disadvantaged" include those that have been denied social experiences common to members of middle-class society. This includes middle-class experiences that provide advantages for upward mobility in our modern society. The "socially disadvantaged" are generally characterized by the following: (1) they are at the bottom of the American society in terms of income; (2) they have a rural background; (3) they suffer from social and economic discrimination at the hands of the majority of the society; (4) they are widely distributed in the United States; while they are mostly visible in the big cities, they are present in all except high income communities. They are prevalent in rural areas, especially in the southern and southwestern states. (Beck, 1967: ix, x)

One definition widely used in identifying the educationally disadvantaged gained importance with the enactment of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, authorizing Federal support to local programs for "educationally deprived" children. The Act defines this group as those whose educational achievement is below, or likely to fall below, that normally expected of children of their age and grade. This term also includes children who are handicapped by physical, mental, or emotional impairment. (U.S.O.E., 1965: 1) Besides differences in educational achievement, an important criterion for identification is family income. Federal guidelines specify the low-income level for eligibility. For example, for fiscal year 1967, the low-income factor was $2,000; for fiscal year 1968, the low-income factor was $3,000.[1] (U.S.O.E., 1967: 2743) Congress re-establishes this standard each succeeding two years in response to current economic conditions.

The disadvantaged came mainly from the following locations. Negroes from the rural South, many of whom have migrated to the northern industrial cities; whites from the rural South many of whom have migrated recently to the northern industrial cities; Puerto Ricans who have migrated to a few northern industrial cities; Mexicans with a rural background who have migrated into the West and Middle West. Also this group includes rural Spanish-Americans in Southwestern states; and European immigrants with a rural background, from Eastern and Southern Europe. (Beck, 1967: x)

---

[1]See Appendix B for the poverty definition of the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

The American Indian constitutes a smaller segment of the "disadvantaged" population. The highly refined culture and alien language with which many Indians begin school creates an additional "built-in" barrier which is evident in this "disadvantaged" group.

The Disadvantaged in Higher Education. How are these **minority** group experiences, and the resultant status, reflected in the characteristics of the disadvantaged student when he enters an institution of higher education?

In a study of "Higher Education for High Risk Students," Egerton, using "high risk" and "disadvantaged" interchangeably, indicates the characteristics of this group. In his terms, the "disadvantaged" are students whose lack of money, low standardized test scores, erratic high school records, race, class, and cultural characteristics, when considered together, place them at a disadvantage in competition with the students in most of the institutions they wish to enter. (Egerton, 1968: 7)

Williams notes similar characteristics among disadvantaged students. Among the similarities he includes lower standardized test scores than those typically earned by regular students in colleges and universities. For example, American College Testing Aptitude Test Scores of 700-800 have been cited as norms for disadvantaged students. In addition, he notes that "many disadvantaged are lower class Blacks attending predominately white institutions." (Williams, 1968: 3) This may have come about, in part, through institutions of higher education who have desired to increase the number of Blacks and have been compelled to recruit in the inner-city.

The University of Wisconsin identified disadvantaged students as being predominantly poor, Black, and with standardized test scores far below the

class average. Some had relatively good high school grades, but all were rated in the bottom one-percent of the University's predicted success scale. (Egerton, 1968: 25)

At Los Angeles City College the "disadvantaged" group included students under 22 years of age with school and College Ability Test scores of 39 or less. Tests given to these students showed that although they were in the lowest quartile of the general population in verbal ability, their non-verbal ability was about normal. The group read at about the eighth grade level and had major adjustment problems. (Young, 1966: 1)

Oberlin's "disadvantaged" consisted of students who required more academic assistance than did regular students to compensate for deficiencies in academic preparation. The students in Oberlin's program ranked lower than the regular Black students and much lower than white students on the SAT's. The disadvantaged also had poor writing and reading skills, little training in mathematics, and poor study habits. (McQueen, 1968: 8)

The Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges. In discussing junior and community college students, in particular, Cross noted some characteristics common among the disadvantaged. Cross stated that this group necessarily comes from the second and third quartiles in ability and from the lower socio-economic strata in our society, since 80%-90% of the brighter students are attending four-year institutions. This group represented lower socio-economic levels and had less academic aptitude and less motivation for intellectual pursuits than students in traditional programs. (Cross, 1964: 1)

Being free or of relatively low cost, the community colleges have not always linked poverty with disadvantagement in selecting students for their

programs. (Knoell, 1969: 3) As has been the practice in four-year institutions, community colleges have identified the disadvantaged as having low ability to succeed in their regular academic program. Rouche studied those who are low-achievers and who have characteristics similar to the disadvantaged in four-year institutions of higher education. This group of students: (1) graduated from high school with a low C average, (2) were severly deficient in basic skills, (3) had poor study habits, (4) were poorly motivated, (5) had unrealistic and ill-defined goals, (6) represented homes with minimal cultural advantages and standards of living, and (7) were the first of their family to attend college. (Rouche, 1968: 12-13)

Williams maintains that some primary characteristics of the "disadvantaged" can contribute toward their potential success in higher education. These include:

> (1) some evidence of ability to handle academic work; e.g., high school grades showing improvement, acceptable achievement at some point, or promising standardized test scores; (2) a willingness to accept some measure of personal responsibility for achievement or failure; (3) at least a minimal perception of self-worth; (4) emotional toughness evidenced by perseverance in the face of frustrating circumstances; (5) intense motivation to improve the circumstances of one's life; (6) some indication of leadership potential; (7) the capacity to think and plan creatively; (8) ability to distinguish realistically between what is desired and what is possible; (9) a special talent (e.g., facility in music, art, or athletics); (10) success in any activity which has required sustained effort. (Williams, 1968: 3-4)

In looking at the range of characteristics ascribed to the disadvantaged, the number and kinds of deficiencies far outnumber the few positive characteristics that colleges and universities can use in identifying and selecting students for whom there might be some chance of success. Certain characteristics seem to be decisive in distinguishing the disadvantaged in

higher education: their cultural and social differences (when compared to the regular student body of the schools they are attending); their membership in minority groups; their lack of parental or self-support to enter or attend college; and their desire and spirit to enter a new situation where there is a high chance of failure.

Despite the range of characteristics and ethnic groups that disadvantaged students represent, however, almost all of these students come to the colleges and universities academically disadvantaged. Many come from minority groups and require some kind of financial aid. They have characteristics so different from the regularly accepted student body that they require special assistance for their success.

In this paper, therefore, we will focus upon the minority group academically disadvantaged students. Specifically, we will examine the perceptions of administrators in public two-year colleges as to the major reasons for attrition of minority group academically disadvantaged students.

Methodological Considerations

Given the foregoing discussion of disadvantaged students in higher education, our methodological considerations revolved around surveying a representative sample of public two-year colleges with respect to their perception of major reasons for the attrition of academically disadvantaged minority group students.

A pre-coded questionnaire was developed for this study and sent to the chief administrative officer of those public two-year institutions participating in the annual research on "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen" conducted by the American Council on Education (ACE). The ACE data bank contains 53 public and private two-year colleges. Some

35 stratification cells were devised by ACE for all institutions of higher education in the United States. (See Table 1) These stratification cells are based upon type of institution (e.g., university, four-year college or two-year college) and type of control (public or private). Two additional variables used in stratifying the institutions were those of affluence and selectivity.[1]

As one may note from Table 1, sampling from the stratification cells for two-year colleges was disproportionate to the population of those cells. Consequently, the data obtained from institutions in the various stratification cells are differentially weighted. The number of institutions in each stratification cell, the cell weight applied to each institution as a consequence of residing in that cell, and the sample response of this study by stratification cell are also given in Table 1.[2] In order to illustrate representativeness to the population of all public two-year colleges in the United States, the data reported in the following section are based upon the weighted "N" as opposed to the actual "N".

---

[1]ACE defines affluence as the per student expenditure for educational and general purposes. Selectivity is defined by the Median Standard Scores in the National Merit Qualifying Test taken by those high school juniors in the spring of 1966 who gave the institution as their first college choice. The rationale for this sample design may be found in the ACE national norms report (Creager, et.al., 1968b) and in an ACE special report (Creager, 1968a).

[2]The sample response for this study was a 92% return. One advantage of the stratification design developed by the ACE research division is that it allows us to more reasonably assume that no severe biases obtain, given a high response rate. In other words, since we have controlled on the most crucial factors which differentiate between institutions, institutions within stratification cells are, for all intents and purposes, interchangeable.

TABLE 1

1970 ACE AND CURRENT STUDY SAMPLE STRATIFICATION CELLS AND WEIGHTS FOR TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Cell Definition	Population	Number Used in ACE Norms	Sample Response to Current Study	Cell Weights[1]
Selectivity less than 400	85	12	11	8
Selectivity 400 or more	116	9	9	13
Expenditures less than $999	184	9	8	23
Expenditures $1000 or more	84	9	8	11
Selectivity and Expenditures Unknown	516	11	11	47
Predominately Black	17	3	2	9

[1]This weight is the ratio between the number of institutions in the population within the stratification cells and the number of institutions in the sample corresponding to those cells.

Data Analysis

The analysis of data centers around those items of the survey questionnaire[1] which requests the institutional representative to estimate the three major reasons for the attrition of academically disadvantaged minority group students. Only institutions having at least nine minority group students and who also had developed either a special program, special courses, or special services for the academically disadvantaged are used in this analysis.

The three major reasons for attrition of academically disadvantaged minority group students in public two-year colleges as estimated by the institutional representative are: inadequate finances, (48% of our respondents listed this as a reason), inadequate emotional stability or immaturity of students (listed by 39% of our respondents), and inadequate motivation (listed by 37% of our respondents). It should also be noted that a large percentage of our respondents also perceive that inadequate institutional finances (listed by 35% of our respondents) and inadequate academic abilities (listed by 34% of our respondents), and the lack of supportive peer relationships (listed by 28% of our respondents) as important reasons for the attrition of minority group academically disadvantaged students. It is most interesting to note that 28% of our respondents cited inadequate institutional support of students as one of the three major reasons of attrition for minority group academically disadvantaged students. Seventeen percent cited inadequacies in administrative

---

[1] See Appendix A, Part II, Question 7.

staffing as one of the three major reasons for attrition; and 14% cited the lack of parental support as a major reason for attrition of minority group academically disadvantaged students. Only 6% of our respondents cited the lack of qualified faculty as one of the major reasons for the attrition of minority group academically disadvantaged students, and none of our respondents cited disciplinary problems as a cause for attrition. (See Table 2)

Summary, Conclusions, and Implications

This paper has undertaken the task of defining the disadvantaged and reviewing the literature describing the disadvantaged in higher education, particularly in two-year colleges. As such, we have reviewed a number of classification schemes and criteria developed by social scientists and educators on the disadvantaged.

This discussion stressed that the definition of "disadvantaged student" is no single statement; "disadvantagement" must be viewed from various perspectives, because disadvantagement is both an effect of the process of acculturation and a limiting cause in future effects of that same process. The term "socially disadvantaged" applies to the process in its earliest causes; the term "culturally disadvantaged" is partly cause, partly effect of social disadvantages; the term "educationally disadvantaged" is a pragmatic descriptive and predictive term necessary for the placement of individuals in our schools; the ESEA definition is a pragmatic political-economic definition necessary for effective allocation of funds. Because education is a collective process, the definition of the students involved in it must also be a collective definition. Our discussion concluded with the observation that disadvantaged students usually come from minority

TABLE 2

INSTITUTIONAL PERCEPTION OF THE MAJOR REASONS FOR ATTRITION OF MINORITY GROUP ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS[1]

Reasons	Public Per Cent Affirmative	Weighted N
Inadequate Motivation	36.8	123
Inadequate Academic Ability	34.4	115
Lack of Parental Support	14.1	47
Disciplinary Problems	0.0	0
Inadequate Institutional Support of Students	28.1	94
Inadequate Qualified Administrative Staff	17.4	58
Lack of Qualified Faculty	5.7	19
Inadequate Finances (Student)	47.9	166
Inadequate Finances (Institution)	35.0	117
Inadequate Emotional Stability or Immaturity	38.6	129
Lack of Supportive Peer Relationships	27.8	93

[1]Each institution surveyed with more than nine academically disadvantaged minority group students and who indicated that they had either a special program, courses or services for such students, was asked to cite the three (3) major reasons for attrition. In effect, each qualified institution in our sample had three "votes"; the "percent affirmitive" column represents those "votes".

groups, are under-represented in institutions of higher education, have little economic support, and are characterized by marginal traditional academic qualifications. Obviously, the kinds of experiences which they have had in lower-class environments has ill-prepared them for success within our formal educational system.

The implication of this discussion for administrators in two-year colleges is that they need to become more sensitive to the perspectives of the behavioral scientists in identifying and selecting students for whom there might be some chance of success. From a review of the characteristics applied to the disadvantaged, it seems that the disadvantaged student who enters college is taking just as great a risk as the school that accepts him, because the number and kinds of deficiencies far outnumber the few positive characteristics that colleges and universities can use in identifying those for whom there might be some chance of success. Marked academic deficiencies, cultural and social groups, lack of parental or self-support to enter or attend college, the risk of a high chance or failure--these frustrations may simply be the beginning of more failure and frustration, or they may be strong enough motives to get the presently disadvantaged student to finally achieve in his academic pursuits.

The final section of this paper concerns the perceptions of administrators in a representative sample of public two-year colleges vis a vis major reasons for attrition of their minority group academically disadvantaged students. From the analysis of their responses, we may conclude that they view the major causes of attrition as being inadequate motivation, inadequate student finances, inadequate emotional stability or maturity, and inadequate academic abilities. Interestingly enough, a large percentage

of respondents from these colleges indicated that there was a lack of institutional support of such students and inadequate institutional finances for such programs in their institutions.

It should be noted that the factors of motivation, academic ability, lack of parental support, lack of adequate finances, and "immaturity" are not only factors often mentioned as reasons for attrition in the literature (and by our respondents), but are also descriptors of minority group academically disadvantaged students in the first instance. In other words, it is these factors that classify the students as disadvantaged in the first place. Therefore, it is not surprising that these are given as major causes for the attrition of such students. What is noteworthy, is the recognition that causes for attrition of minority group academically disadvantaged students may also be the lack of institutional support of these students as characterized by inadequate institutional finances, and inadequately trained administrative and teaching staffs. Such recognition is encouraging, and indicates that if public two-year colleges are to adequately perform their role in providing educational opportunity for those who thus far have had little chance for higher education, greater effort in terms of energy, financial resources, and perhaps most importantly, the support and training of an adequate administrative and teaching staff is essential.

APPENDIX B

Poverty Definition--U.S. Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce
(December 31, 1969)

1. Family Size	Non Farm	Farm
1	* $1,800	$1,500
2	2,400	2,000
3	3,000	2,500
4	3,600	3,000
5	4,200	3,500
6	4,800	4,000
7	5,400	4,500
8	6,000	5,000
9	6,600	5,500
10	7,200	6,000

Characteristics of Disadvantaged Students for Special Programs

1. Students with inadequate high school preparation
2. Students who are recipients of welfare or vocational rehabilitation program benefits
3. Students who live in public housing for the poor
4. Students for whom standard English is a second language
5. Students whose cultural heritage is not sufficiently or accurately represented in the traditional curriculum

*All dollar amounts denote net income before taxes

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey of Two-Year Programs for the Academically Disadvantaged

PART I. BASIC INFORMATION

Please indicate your response by circling the appropriate number.

	YES	NO
1. Does your institution have an open admissions policy		
a. for in-district students	1	2
b. for out-of-district students	1	2
c. for out-of-state students	1	2
2. Which of the following are required for admission to your institution? (Please circle all that apply)		
a. High school diploma or equivalent	1	2
b. Minimum age (_____)	1	2
c. High school grade average (_____)	1	2
d. Test scores	1	2
e. Interview	1	2
f. Letter or recommendation	1	2
g. Physical examination	1	2
h. Other (please specify) _____	1	2
3. Does your institution have any of the following counseling services?		
a. Personal	1	2
b. Academic	1	2
c. Vocational-occupational	1	2
d. Job placement	1	2
e. Job placement follow-up	1	2

Please answer questions 4 through 9 either from your records or from your general knowledge. Please enter "0" if the answer is none. (It is not necessary to make a special survey for this study.) Indicate the accuracy of your answer by circling one of the following:

A -- VERY ACCURATE
B -- REASONABLY ACCURATE
C -- ROUGH ESTIMATE

		Accuracy Estimate
4. In the Fall of 1970, how many students (full-time and part-time) were enrolled in your institution?	_____	A B C
Of this number, what percent were enrolled in the following curricular programs:		
a. Academic (transfer or preprofessional)	____%	A B C
b. Occupational (associate degree)	____%	A B C
c. Occupational (certificate)	____%	A B C
d. Continuing Education (Adult, special interest courses)	____%	A B C
e. Developmental, Preparatory, or Remedial	____%	A B C

5. During the 1969-70 academic year in the TRANSFER program, what percent of your students (full-time and part-time)

		Accuracy Estimate
a. transferred to another college	____%	A B C
b. transferred to the OCCUPATIONAL curriculum	____%	A B C
c. withdrew for employment related to their schooling	____%	A B C
d. withdrew for employment not related to their schooling	____%	A B C
e. withdrew because of academic failure	____%	A B C
f. withdrew for other reasons	____%	A B C

If your institution has no OCCUPATIONAL program, please skip to question 7.

6. During the 1969-70 academic year in the OCCUPATIONAL program (degree and certificate), what percent of your students (full-time and part-time)

a. transferred to another college	____%	A B C
b. transferred to the TRANSFER program	____%	A B C
c. withdrew for employment related to their schooling	____%	A B C
d. withdrew for employment not related to their schooling	____%	A B C
e. withdrew because of academic failure	____%	A B C
f. withdrew for other reasons	____%	A B C

7. In the Fall of 1970, how many MINORITY GROUP* students (full-time and part-time) were enrolled in your institution? _____ A B C

If your institution has less than 10 minority group students, please skip to question 10.

Of the MINORITY GROUP students enrolled, what percent were enrolled in the following curricular programs:

a. Academic (transfer or preprofessional)	____%	A B C
b. Occupational (associate degree)	____%	A B C
c. Occupational (certificate)	____%	A B C
d. Continuing Education (Adult, special interest courses)	____%	A B C
e. Developmental, Preparatory, or Remedial	____%	A B C

8. During the 1969-70 academic year in the TRANSFER program, what percent of your MINORITY GROUP students (full-time and part-time)

a. transferred to another college	____%	A B C
b. transferred to the OCCUPATIONAL curriculum	____%	A B C
c. withdrew for employment related to their schooling	____%	A B C
d. withdrew for employment not related to their schooling	____%	A B C
e. withdrew because of academic failure	____%	A B C
f. withdrew for other reasons	____%	A B C

If your institution has no OCCUPATIONAL program, please skip to question 10.

*Those students who have Spanish surnames, are Black or American Indian

9. During the 1969-70 academic year in the OCCUPATIONAL program (degree and certificate), what percent of your MINORITY GROUP students (full-time and part-time)

		Accuracy Estimate
a. transferred to another college	____%	A B C
b. transferred to the TRANSFER program	____%	A B C
c. withdrew for employment related to their schooling	____%	A B C
d. withdrew for employment not related to their schooling	____%	A B C
e. withdrew because of academic failure	____%	A B C
f. withdrew for other reasons	____%	A B C

10. Is there a post-secondary technical-vocational school within one-hour travel time of your institution?

YES	NO
1	2

11. Please estimate the percentage of your student body who predominately use the following means of transportation to arrive at your institution:

a. walk	____%
b. public transportation	____%
c. privately owned vehicle	____%

Part II. SPECIAL PROGRAMS, COURSES, OR SERVICES FOR THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

The following questions relate to special programs, courses, or services which some institutions have developed as a consequence of recent national attention on the academically disadvantaged, i.e., on those students who do not normally qualify for degree programs.

	No. of Minority Group Students	No. of Other Students
1. APPROXIMATELY how many such students are enrolled at your institution? (If none, please so indicate.)	_____	_____

2. Has your institution:

	YES	NO
a. developed a special program for the academically disadvantaged?	1	2
b. developed courses which could be classified as remedial or developmental?	1	2
c. developed special services, e.g., tutoring, counseling, financial aid for those who are academically disadvantaged?	1	2

If the responses to all questions in item two (2) above were NO, please fold this questionnaire and return it in the envelop provided. If not, please continue.

	No. of Minority Group Students	No. of Other Students
3. APPROXIMATELY how many students have you enrolled in a Special Program for the academically disadvantaged? (A program which is distinct from the regular college program?)		
Fall '69	_____	_____
Fall '70	_____	_____

	No. of Minority Group Students	No. of Other Students
4. APPROXIMATELY how many students who are enrolled in the regular program are enrolled in developmental or remedial courses in addition to the regular programs? (Please do not include those in 3.)	_____	_____

(If your institution had no special program in the 1969-70 academic year, please skip to question 6.)

5. Please ESTIMATE the number of students in the special program for the academically disadvantaged in the 1969-70 academic year who

a. dropped out of school	_____	_____
b. transferred into:		
Transfer program	_____	_____
Occupational: degree program	_____	_____
Occupationa: certificate program	_____	_____
Continuing education program	_____	_____

6. Which of the following items are included in programs and/or services for the MINORITY GROUP academically disadvantaged?

	YES	NO
a. Recruitment teams	1	2
b. List of community contacts for "leads" to minority group students	1	2
c. Lower admissions requirements	1	2
d. Extra counseling and guidance	1	2
e. Special tutoring	1	2
(if YES, please identify the kinds of persons utilized as tutors)		
Regular faculty	1	2
Special faculty	1	2
Regular students	1	2
Advanced students in the program	1	2
f. Programmed instruction	1	2
g. Reduced course loads	1	2
h. Liberalized probationary or readmission practices		
i. Instruction in developmentof study skills	1	2
j. Special course in particular ethnic studies	1	2
k. Stress on communication skills	1	2
(If YES, please indicate particular areas)		
Reading	1	2
Writing	1	2
Speaking	1	2
Listening	1	2
Utilization of traditional English	1	2
Understanding of student's own dialect as a language system	1	2

1. Financial aid
   (Please indicate sources and type of aid by circling as many as apply below._

	Type of Aid					
Source	Scholarship	Guaranteed loan	Work Study	Co-op	Other	None
Federal	1	2	3	4	5	6
State	1	2	3	4	5	6
Institu-tional	1	2	3	4	5	6
Private	1	2	3	4	5	6

7. What (in your opinion) are the THREE MAJOR REASONS for attrition of MINORITY GROUP students?
   (Circle three reasons only.)

   a. Inadequate motivation
   b. Inadequate academic ability
   c. Lack of parental support
   d. Disciplinary problems
   e. Inadequate institutional support of students
   f. Inadequate qualified administrative staff
   g. Lack of qualified faculty
   h. Inadequate finances (student)
   i. Inadequate finances (institution)
   j. Inadequate emotional stability of immaturity
   k. Lack of supportive peer relationships

	YES	NO
8. Do you have any special instructional or training programs to assist your faculty to work with academically deficient students?	1	2

Name of individual completing this questionnaire:

_____

Title: _____

Phone number: _____ - _____ - _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beck, John M., and Richard W. Saxe. Teaching the Disadvantaged Pupil. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1967.

Cross, K. Patricia. "Higher Education's Newest Student." Junior College Journal. 39:1, Sept., 1968.

Egerton, John. Higher Education for "High Risk" Students. Southern Education Foundation. Atlanta, Georgia. April, 1968.

Federal Register, Vol. 32, No. 27, Part II. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, D.C., February 9, 1967.

Gordon, Edmund W., and Dokey A. Wilkerson. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged: Programs and Practices, Preschool through College, New York. College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Kneller, George F. Educational Anthropology. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Knoell, Dorothy M. "Outreach to the Disadvantaged." Understanding Students and Counseling Two-Year Colleges. Two Year College Student Development Center. State University of New York at Albany, June, 1969.

McKendall, Benjamin W., Jr. "Breaking the Barriers of Cultural Disadvantage and Curriculum Imbalance." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 47, No. 7, March, 1965.

McQueen, Albert. "Black Students at Oberlin." Oberlin Alumni Magazine, June, 1968.

Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1962.

Roueche, John E. Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College. Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

School Programs for Educationally Deprived Chidren, Basic Facts for School Administrator. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Washington, D.C., October, 1965.

Williams, Robert L. "What Are We Learning From Current University Programs for Disadvantaged Students?" Tennessee University, November 12, 1968.

Young, Edwin A. "An Experimental Program for 'Low Ability' Students Second Progress Report," California: Los Angeles City College. February, 1966.